

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 28, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137065 (Medower). Further, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Medower in view U.S. Patent No. 6,872,511 (Hirokane). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2 and 4-10 are patentable Medower and Hirokane for at least the following reasons.

Medower is directed to use of a mother stamper for optical disk molding. As shown in FIG 1, and described in paragraph [0036], a glass master disk (also referred to as a "master") 100 is

coated with a film 102 to improve adhesion for a deposited layer of photoresist 104. The film 102 can be chrome, a saline coupling agent, or other suitable film.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the substrate has a metallic surface in contact with the photoresist layer and the photoresist layer has a thickness  $d_r < 100\text{nm}$  to improve photoresist wall steepness, and

wherein the metallic surface comprises Ni or Au.

A metallic surface comprising Ni or Au is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Medower. Rather, Medower discloses a chrome film for improving adhesion of the photoresist 104. Hirokane is cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Hirokane.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 4-10 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or

averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
June 30, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101